

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their attorney, B. Joe Kim, during a personal interview conducted on April 4, 2006. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the §112, first paragraph rejection of the claims relating to the language, "first connector" and "second connector" recited in claim 24. Applicants' attorney argued that the recited language is supported in Fig. 8, the "first connector" being the connector extending parallel (horizontally) to the capacitance electrode Cs and the "second connector" being the connector extending perpendicularly (vertically) to the capacitance electrode Cs.

The rejection of the pending claims as being anticipated by Takeda et al. was also discussed. Applicant's attorney argued 1) that the cited reference does not disclose the fine pitch electrode patterns being mutually connected to each other; 2) that the reference does not disclose the claimed first and second connectors; and 3) that the cited reference does not disclose the claimed cutout pattern. The Examiner agreed to further reconsider the rejections based on the arguments presented by Applicants' attorney when they are formally filed in an Amendment. The remarks in this Amendment follow the arguments presented during the interview.

Claim 33 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to correct an informality.

All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner

contends that the “first connector” and “second connector” recited in claim 24 are not supported in the specification. The drawings are objected to for the same reason.

As discussed during the interview, the claimed features are shown in Fig. 8. The horizontal connector which is parallel to the capacitance electrode Cs and shown in the middle of the pixel, supports the claimed first connector, and the vertically extending connector (perpendicular to the capacitance electrode Cs) supports the claimed second connector. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112 rejection and the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 26 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended in a readily apparent manner to overcome the rejection, withdrawal of which is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-34, 36, 37 and 74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The present invention includes, among other things, fine pitch electrode patterns on a first electrode. The electrode patterns extend in a first direction and are repeated to be arranged at intervals in a second direction. The electrode patterns are also mutually connected to each other by a first connector which is substantially parallel to the direction in which a capacitance electrode extends, and a second connector which extends in a direction other than the direction of the capacitance electrode. The first electrode also has a cutout pattern extending in the second direction (which is vertical or perpendicular to the first

direction in which the electrode patterns extend). The Takeda et al. reference does not disclose (or suggest) these features of the present invention.

The Examiner cites Figs. 51 and 52 of the Takeda et al. reference as disclosing the fine pitch electrode patterns. These figures show slits 21 being formed on the electrode 13 on the bottom substrate 17. A protrusion 20C is formed within these slits. The figures also show protrusions 20A which are formed on the opposite electrode 12 on the upper substrate 16.

Since the Examiner has indicated that the substrate 17 discloses the claimed first substrate and the electrode 13 discloses the claimed first electrode, the protrusions 20C must disclose the claimed fine pitch electrode patterns, because the claims call for the electrode patterns to be formed on the first electrode. This being the case, Fig. 51 of the Takeda et al. reference simply does not show that the protrusions 20C are mutually connected to each other. To the contrary, the figures show the protrusions 20C being isolated from each other within the separated slits 13. Therefore, Fig. 51 clearly shows that the protrusions 20C are not connected to each other at all, either by a first or a second connector.

The Examiner contends that the electrode patterns are “mutually connected each other by a first connector substantially parallel to a direction in which a capacitance electrode 35 extends.” Fig. 51 shows that the capacitance electrode 35 extends horizontally across the page. The protrusions 20C themselves extend approximately at a 45° angle to the capacitance electrode 35. None of the protrusions 20C are shown to be connected by a “connector” either extending parallel to the capacitance electrode 35 or otherwise.

The Examiner contends that the claimed second connector is “unnumbered vertical layers interconnecting electrode patterns 20C shown in Figs. 51 and 52.” As clearly shown in Fig. 51, there is no vertical layer that even remotely touches or connects the electrode patterns 20C. To the contrary, Fig. 51 clearly shows that the protrusions 20C are independent islands and do not connect to each other. The reference discloses that the layer 43 immediately under electrode 13 is an insulating layer, as more clearly shown in Fig. 17 and Fig. 46 (Fig. 46 shows the slits 21 on the electrode 13 without the projection 20C). For these reasons, Takeda et al. does not disclose (or suggest) the electrode pattern being mutually connected or that they are connected by a first and second connectors.

The Examiner also contends that the claimed cutout pattern is disclosed by the slit 21. The claimed cutout pattern extends in a second direction which is the same direction in which the electrode patterns are repeated to be arranged. In other words, it is generally perpendicular to the direction in which the fine pitch electrode patterns extend. Since the Examiner contends that the claimed electrode patterns are disclosed by the protrusions 20C, for Takeda to disclose the cutout pattern, the slit 21 must also extend perpendicularly to the protrusions 20C. However, as clearly shown in Fig. 51 the slits 21 extend parallel to the protrusions 20C, since the protrusions 20C are formed within the longitudinal direction of the slit 21. Thus, the Takeda reference also does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed cutout pattern as described in claim 24.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

April 27, 2006

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978